



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

was the first to mention Machiavelli" (p. 16).

"Soon after Ascham's book, however, Machiavelli began to interest English readers, as he had already done French. The case of young Gabriel Harvey is typical of this movement: at twenty-three years of age in 1573, a student at Cambridge, he had not read the Florentine's works, but was eager to see them, and begged Remington to loan him his copy," (p. 17). . . .

"Incontinently Harvey was perusing and re-perusing Machiavelli," (p. 18.) Sidney, too, had become acquainted with "Machiavelli's works: probably at Oxford," (p. 18).

"The rapidity with which Machiavelli came into favor at Cambridge, and the extent to which he was read, is remarkable: in 1579, Harvey claimed his works had supplanted all others, . . . now Greene was a student at Cambridge in this year, and Marlowe in the next: . . . Harvey accuses both the dramatists of having used Machiavellian principles in their profligate lives, and Greene confesses it true" (p. 25).

"In the same year Harvey informed Spencer:—Machiavel a great man' at Cambridge, and Italian studies flourishing" (p. 25).

"Thus the safe conclusion is that Kyd used the Principe in portraying Lorenzo" (p. 33).

"He (Marlowe) had studied Machiavelli with a vengeance: and it may be stated as an absolute certainty, that had the Principe never been written, his three great heroes would not have been drawn with such gigantic strokes" (p. 34).

Many more citations might be given showing how the book sought to prove the play-wrights had almost all read Machiavelli in the original Italian or French translation.

"Elizabethan play-wrights had the 'Prince' always within easy reach, however, in the French translation of 1553, and that of 1586, which appeared just when the great drama was burgeoning" (p. 3).

That the dramatists drew from prevalent popular prejudice rather than from their own studies is patent and reasonable to any one who knows how play-wrights must pander to the public.

"Greene had been long in Italy, and was well read in . . . Machiavelli, but in his use of the latter he seems to have sacrificed his own knowledge to that panderism to public taste and feeling, which was so characteristic of the gifted writer" (p. 27).

Mohl says that Gentillet became the great arsenal for the maxims, and Burd says it was the source of Machiavellianism (pp. 8-9). How the dramatists used Gentillet instead of Machiavelli, one instance will suffice, Chapman's

"Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany," where the English is a direct translation of the French and not the Italian:—

'1. A prince must be of the nature of the lion and the fox, but not the one without the other.' I, 1 (Shepherd 382).

Gentillet says:—

'Le Prince doit ensuyure la nature du Lyon, et du Renard: non l'un sans l'autre,' p. 384.

Patericke translates:—

'A prince ought to follow the nature of the Lyon and of the Fox, yet not of the one without the other.'

Machiavelli says:—

'Essendo adunque un principe necessitato sapere bene usare la bestia, debbe di quella pigliare la volpe ed il leone: perchè il leone non si difende dai lacci, la volpe non si difende da' lupi. Bisogna adunque essere volpe a conoscere i lacci, e leone a sbggotire i lupi. Coloro che stanno semplicemente in sul leone non se ne intendono' (xviii).

Chapman the scholar certainly knew both Machiavelli and Gentillet. It is plain which he used.

Why does Miss Scott devote a page to stating as her own ideas, those palpably taken from the book in question, and already accepted by reviewers and scholars? Those interested may compare Koppel's review in the *Englische Studien* (1897): *The Nation* Vol. 64, p. 225: Prof. Dr. J. Schick's edition of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, p. 140, or John Morley's *Machiavelli*, p. 40.

EDWARD MEYER.

Western Reserve University.

MILTON'S *L'ALLEGRO* 25.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS: It has never, I think, been noticed that Milton's

Haste thee, Nymph, and bring with thee
Jest and youthful Jollity

may owe something to Horace, *Od.* 1. 30. 5-8:

Fervidus tecum puer et solutus
Gratiae zonis properentque Nymphae
Et parum comis sine te Juventas
Mercuriusque.

The Latin poet is invoking Venus (cf. *L'Al.* 14), mentions the Nymphs and Graces (cf. *L'Al.* 15, 25), has an equivalent for 'Haste' and 'with thee,' and suggests Milton's 'youthful' by his 'Juventas,' and perhaps Jest and Jollity by 'Mercurius.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.